



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,810	09/29/2003	Andrew John Farnsworth	1578.619(PUS-1155)	2209
54120 7590 07/02/2007 RESEARCH IN MOTION, LTD 102 DECKER CT. SUITE 180 IRVING, TX 75062			EXAMINER VU, MICHAEL T	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,810

Applicant(s)

FARNSWORTH, ANDREW JOHN

Examiner

Michael Vu

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-9,11 and 13-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-9,11 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 13, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6 and 13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claims, can not depend on another multiple depend claim (note claim 5). See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 6 and 13 are not been further treated on the merits.

For Example: A method according to claim 1, 2, or 4, and 8, 9, or 11.

3. Dependent Claims are objected to because of the following informalities: "**A method.....**" should replace **the method** instead, and **spelling out the words, for example URA, RRC, UE etc.. in the claims.**

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 7-9, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggenti (US 2003/0012149) in view of Sarkkinen (US 2003/0119533), and further in view of Neumann (US 6,792,270).

Regarding **claims 1 and 8**, Maggenti teaches a method of processing messages received by a device from a network (Figs. 1-2, [0033-0039]), the method comprising: receiving a message at the device that indicates that the device should be in a dedicated channel state [0006],

but is silent on wherein the message is **one of** the following: a Cell Update Confirm message or a URA Update Confirm message or RRC Connection setup message; and, in response to the message, clearing from the device any record of a cell identifier.

However, Sarkkinen teaches a method and apparatus for keeping track of User equipment (UE) locations for performing multicast services in a network that includes a

Radio Resource Controller (RRC) connection in response to the message, updating and cleaning or clearing or deleting of the record can be made based on User Equipments' identification (see Figs. 1-12, [0005-0009, 0034, 0041-0042, 0077]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maggenti, such that wherein the message **is one of** the following: a Cell Update Confirm message or a URA Update Confirm message or RRC Connection setup message; and, in response to the message, clearing from the device any record of a cell identifier, for allowing the Radio network Controller to keep track a record of the UEs locations on the network.

But Maggenti/Sarkkinen do not clearly teach on an optionally sending a response message receivable by the network, after the UE is cleared of any record of a cell identifier.

However, Neumann teaches a method for setting up and/or updating the device includes a message contained in the cell identifier, which cleared, deleted the old entry and to store a new entry with the updated data and/or further deleting, storing or updating identifying information about virtual connection (See paragraphs Col.1, line 55 through Col. 2, line 2, Col.5, line 3 through Col. 6, line 67, Col. 7, lines 45-67, claim 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maggenti/Sarkkinen, such that an optionally sending a response message receivable by the network, after the UE is cleared of any record of a cell identifier, to allows for the automated set-up of a device and/or for setting up and updating immediately after each modification of connections.

Regarding **claims 2 and 9**, Maggenti/Sarkkinen/Neumann teach the method according to claim 1 wherein the dedicated channel is a Cell_DCH channel [0047-0063] of Sarkkinen.

Regarding **claims 7 and 14**, Maggenti/Sarkkinen/Neumann teach the method according to claim 1 wherein when the message includes a new cell identifier, the method further comprises, in response to the message, not storing in the device any record of the cell identifier included in the message [0037-043, 0074] of Sarkkinen.

Regarding **claim 15**, Maggenti/Sarkkinen/Neumann teach the mobile telecommunication device incorporating apparatus according to claim 8, (See Figs 2-12) of Sarkkinen.

6. Claims 4, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggenti/Sarkkinen/Neumann, in further view of Wu (US 2003/0210676).

Regarding **claims 4 and 11**, Maggenti/Sarkkinen teach the method according to claim 1, **but are silent on** wherein the cell identifier is a Cell Radio Network Temporary Identifier.

However, Wu teaches a wireless communications, telecommunication systems such as 3G or UTMS radio interface protocol architecture that implement in both the UTRAN and the UE, including an RRC layer to provide the mobility information of a Cell Radio Network Temporary Identifier (C_RNTI) used as UE to identifiers within an UTRAN in signaling messages between UE and UTRAN [0060].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maggenti/Sarkkinen, such that wherein the cell identifier is a Cell Radio Network Temporary Identifier, to enhance the mobility of the user equipments connected over the radio network.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-8131. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/673,810

Page 7

Art Unit: 2617



Michael Vu
Examiner



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER